REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-17 and 19-22 are currently pending in connection with the present application. Claims 20-22 are newly added. Claims 1, 12 and 19 are independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 17 and 19 are amended. No new matter is added by the claim amendments or new claims 20-22.

35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as detailed below.

Claims 1, 12 and 19 are amended to have proper antecedent basis. In particular, "the bit" is amended to "the at least one bit."

Claims 9, 10 and 17 are amended to properly depend from claims 6, 3 and 13, respectively. Support for these amendments can be found on page 4, lines 21-26 of the specification which describes how negotiation of parameters is performed when the portion of the access network communicating with the access terminal operates according to a parameter group other than the default parameter group for the associated parameter group type. Thus Applicants submit that the feature "after negotiations are complete" is now clear.

In light of the above, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Immonen in View of Rasanen Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 12, 15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Immonen et al, (US Publication #2002/0132611), hereinafter 'Immonen', in view of Rasanen, (US Publication #2005/0286418), hereinafter 'Rasanen'. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as detailed below.

The Examiner asserts that Immonen teaches substantially the same invention as claimed in the present application. Applicants submit that although Immonen teaches sending a "connection request", there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of a token being sent in addition to the connection request. A token is used to designate exclusive permission to communicate with the network. Accordingly, Immonen fails to disclose, teach or suggest "receiving, at an access network, an access request and a token from an access terminal" as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner relies on Rasanen to teach the use of a token "including at least one bit associated with a parameter group type" as recited in claim 1. However, Rasanen merely teaches transmitting a call setup message containing a bearer capability information element which indicates the type of call requested and the required protocol. This information element bears no resemblance to a token as there is indication of the inclusion of parameter group types which govern the communication/permission between the access terminals and network. As such, Rasanen fails to disclose, teach or suggest "receiving, at an access network, an access request and a token from an access terminal" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that Immonen in view of Rasanen would not render the claimed invention obvious to one skilled in the art.

For somewhat similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, independent claims 12 and 19 are also patentable over Immonen and Rasanen. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 1, 12 and 19, and dependent claims 2-10 and 13-17, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Immonen and Rasanen in Further View of Bender Rejection

The Examiner rejects claims 3, 5-6, 8-10, 13, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Immonen and Rasanen in further view of Bender et al., (US Patent No. 6,539,030), hereinafter 'Bender'. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as detailed below.

This rejection is respectfully traversed in that even assuming *arguendo* Bender could be combined with Immonen and Rasanen (which Applicants do not admit), Bender suffers from the same deficiencies as Immonen and Rasanen with respect to claims 1, 12, and 19. Therefore, the combination of Immonen and Rasanen with Bender still fails to teach all features of claims 3, 5-6, 8-10, 13, 14, 16 and 17. For at least these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 20-22, are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons given above regarding the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-10, 12-17, 19, 20-22 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application, and the required fee of $120.00 is attached.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: _____ 55,149

FoR Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/SAE/MAH